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## Ranking Rubric and Evaluation Form

**Grant Application for Student Academic Conference Support**

Title of Presentation: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
  
Name of Student: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Name of Mentor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
  
Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date of Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
  
Instructions: After reviewing the grant application, please rate it using the criteria below. Circle the number on the scale that best describes your judgment on each criterion.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rating scale: | 1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree | 3 = Neither agree or disagree | 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly agree |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Scale** |
| 1. The research to be presented is well-defined and rigorous. The aims, methodology, results and contributions of the work are clearly explained in the abstract.  Comments: | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. The conference which has accepted the work for presentation is an appropriate venue. The quality of academic dialogue can be expected to be high.  Comments: | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. The acceptance communication from the conference organizers is professional and reflects a high level of satisfaction with the quality of the student's submission.  Comments: | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. The letter from the faculty mentor reflects strong support for the student's work and its presentation at the conference.  Comments: | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. The budget request is clearly described and appropriate. Comments: | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. The presentation at the conference will foster a deepening of a culture of inquiry at Lewis University.  Comments: | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| SUM OF POINTS | \_\_\_\_\_\_/30\_ |
| Other Comments |  |
|  |  |

What is your overall recommendation?  
\_\_\_\_\_\_ Approve  
  
\_\_\_\_\_\_ Approve, pending additional information or clarification  
  
\_\_\_\_\_\_ Do not approve